

The University of Chicago

RISE OF TURKISH POWER IN
CENTRAL ASIA; HISTORY OF THE
EASTERN TURKS (522-745)

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1938

By
HARALD JACOBSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1941

The University of Chicago

RISE OF TURKISH POWER IN
CENTRAL ASIA; HISTORY OF THE
EASTERN TURKS (522-745)

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE
HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES

1938

By
HARALD JACOBSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1941



INTRODUCTION

At the commencement of the sixth century Central Asia was ruled by two great nomad powers. In the east the Juan-juan, or true Avars, controlled the Mongolian plain from Corea to Dzungaria. However, as a result of the vigorous military policy employed by the Wei rulers of north China against the nomads the Juan-juan had suffered a serious defeat in 448; nevertheless, they were still recognized as lords of this region by other nomad tribes. In the west the Ephthalites held sway over all territory north of the northeastern frontiers of Persia, extending to the Jaxartes River and Khotan. Formerly they had been subject to the Juan-juan but having increased in power they broke away from Juan-juan sovereignty to establish an independent empire. Such was the setting when the Turks first appear in history.

The following abbreviations are used in the text (including facts of publication omitted in the notes):

Beal, Samuel. Si-yu-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World. 2 vols. London; Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1906.

Chavannes, Documents E. Chavannes, Documents sur les Tou-kiue (Turcs) occidentaux. St. Petersburg, 1903.

Czaplioka, Mary Antoine. The Turks of Central Asia in History and at the Present Day. Oxford; The Clarendon Press, 1918.

EHR The English Historical Review.

FHG Carl Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Paris: Ambrosio Firmin Didot, 1851.

Franko, Otto. Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches. Vol. II. Berlin; Walter de Gruyter, 1936.

Hirth, Nachworte F. Hirth, Nachworte zur Inschrift des Tonjukuk. Anhang zu W. Radloff, Die alttürkischen Inschriften der Mongolei. Vol. II. St. Petersburg, 1899.

HJAS Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies.

Marquart, Josef. Eränsähr nach der Geographie des Ps. Moses Xorenac i. "Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, philo-

logisch-historische Klasse," III (Göttingen, 1901).

MSF-Ou. "Mémoire de la Société Finno-Ougrienne."

Nöldeke, Tabarī. T. Nöldeke, Geschichte der Perser und Araber zur Zeit der Sasaniden. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1879.

Ork. Ins. Orkhon Inscription.

Parker, E. H. A Thousand Years of the Tartars. 2d edition revised. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1924.

Smith, Vincent A. The Early History of India. 4th ed. revised by S. M. Edwardes. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1924.

Thomsen, Vilhelm. Samlede Afhandlinger. Kopenhagen: Gyldendalske Bogenhandel, 1922.

Warner and Warner, The Shahnāma. A. G. and E. Warner, The Shahnama of Firdausi. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1915.

WZKM Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes.

Zotenberg, Tabarī. H. Zotenberg, Chronique de Abou-Djafar-Mo'Hammud-ben-Djarīr-ben Yezid Tabarī. Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale, 1896.

CHAPTER II

FOUNDING OF THE EMPIRE

As the Wei Dynasty declined, its authority in Central Asia waned, thus enabling the Juan-juan to increase in influence and power. In 519 Anakui, the most vigorous of the Juan-juan kings, assumed the rôle of leadership.¹ A marriage contract allied the Juan-juan with the other great Central Asian nation, the Ephthalites,² while Anakui's ever restless forces swept all tribes between Qara Shahr and Corea under his banner.³

Among the many peoples recognizing the suzerainty of the Juan-juan were the servile Turks who tendered indispensable service as blacksmiths.⁴

¹Chavannes, Documents, p. 221. Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, II, 231, gives 520. Anakui is perhaps the same personal name as the name of the unknown Qaghan to whom Tiberius sent Valentine as ambassador in 576, Menander Protector, Frag. 43 (FHG, IV, 245); this was pointed out by Hirth, Nachworte, p. 110, n. 1.

²Pei Shih, ch. 97, 24 b.

³Chavannes, Documents, p. 221; Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, II, pp. 230-31.

⁴Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 2 a; Sui Shu, ch. 84, 1 b. This is the earliest evidence for the name Turk. It appears in these Chinese annals as 突厥 T'u-chüeh, K 498, 503, t'ust (or d'ust)-ki⁴ot, which is said to mean "helmet" in Turkish. The explanation is that the Turks lived near a helmet-shaped hill and were therefore called T'u-chüeh. Boodberg, "The Language of the T'o-pa Wei," HJAS, I (1936), 182, n. 19a, cites Pelliot as the authority for the derivation of T'u-chüeh from an unknown Türküt; cf. also, Franke, Geschichte des chinesischen Reiches, II, 231. Boodberg suggests that Türküt is perhaps derived from *duyulyat the plural of duyulya--"helmet." He further suggests the possibility of its being derived from the Mongolian tögürük, "circle"--*tögürük > *tü'ürük > *türük, op. cit., p. 182, n. 18. The helmet idea is generally held to be folk-etymology. Thomsen, Samlede Afhandlinger, III, 465, believed that türk or türük originally meant "strength, power." It is doubtful that the name Turk is in any way connected with the Turrya > Turan of the Avesta as suggested by Blochet, "Le nom des Turks dans l'Avesta," JRAS, 1915, 306; and after him Czaplicka, The Turks of Central Asia, pp. 18-19. F. W. Thomas, "Tibetan Documents Concerning Chinese Turkestan," JRAS, 1931, 807, 821; 1927, 85, follows Pelliot in identifying the Dru-gu (Drug-gu) of Tibetan texts with the Turks. The Dru-gu country is mentioned in several documents, some of which, as those bearing the dates 675 A.D., 676 and

Their original habitat seems to have been on the thickly wooded southern slopes of the Altai Mountains¹ where game was abundant. Before them lay a vast plateau admirably suited to the needs of the herding nomad in respect to vegetation.

Prior to their subjugation by the Juan-juan nothing definite is known about the Turks. Tradition tells us that they descended from a wolf which escaped to a mountain enclosure and there gave birth to ten human sons. These sons went abroad to find wives, then returned again to their mountain home. Eventually their descendants outgrew the confines of their aboriginal home necessitating a shift of abode. For this reason their leader, a certain Asena, led them across the mountains where he submitted to the Juan-juan.²

686, would fit the Turks chronologically. Originally this name belonged to just one clan, and when this clan gained paramount power all subject peoples accepted its name as their tribal name also. According to Rashid ed-Din, a similar case occurred when the Mongols rose to power, cf. Blochet, Introduction a l'histoire des Mongols de Fadl Allah Rashid ed-Din (Leyden; E. J. Brill, 1910), p. 202; B. Y. Vladimirtsov, The Life of Chingis-Khan, trans. D. S. Mirsky (London; George Routledge and Sons, 1930), pp. 5-6.

¹Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 1 b; Sui Shu, ch. 84, 1 b; Hsin T'ang Shu, ch. 215 shang, 5 b. This 金山 Chin Shan, "Golden Mountain," is not identical to the Ektag of Zemarohus as assumed by Thomsen, Inscriptions de l'Orkhon ("MSP-Ou.", V [1896]), p. 61. This has been adequately shown by Chavannes, Documents . . . , pp. 235 ff. It is generally accepted that these Chin Shan refer to the Altai Mountains and not to the Chin Shan of Kansu as was suggested by Parker, "The Origin of the Turks," EHR, XI (1896), 435 ff.; A Thousand Years of the Tartars, p. 130. Cf. Pelliot, "Neuf notes sur des questions d'Asie Centrale," T'oung Pao, XXVI (1929), 214, n. 2.

²Chou Shu, ch. 50, 1 b; Sui Shu, ch. 84, 1 a; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 1 a-b. According to these accounts the Turks were descended from one of the ancient Hsiung-nu clans. Several attempts have been made to explain the name 阿史那 A-shih-na, E 1, 885, 647, ḥ.â-ḥi-ḥ.â. T. W. Kingmill, "Notes and Queries," The China Review, XXIV (1899-1900), 245, recognizes in it the Turkish word "arslan" ارسلان "lion"; it is found in the name Alp Arslan "Bold Lion," the name of a later Turkish chief. Boodberg, HJAS, I (1936), 182, suggests that in view of the tradition that accompanies the name Asena, it might be connected with the Turkish root "as," "to cross a mountain." He also refers, n. 19, to an etymology advanced by a writer in Sino Altaica I, 15, where "âginâ is derived from *ar-çinca--"ten wolves." Our knowledge of the pre-history of the Turks does not permit us to attempt a final settlement of this problem yet. De Guignes, I, Part II, 373, suggested that "wolf" possibly referred to a woman who bore such a name.

Boodberg, HJAS, I (1936), 181, has pointed out that the essential elements of this tradition accords with the motif to be found in the Gog and Magog legends. The general pattern of these stories is as follows: Somewhere in the interior of Asia between two mountains live a people of unorthodox

For several generations the Turks were content with their status as blacksmith slaves. Then approximately a century after Asena one of his descendants known as T'u-mên¹ succeeded as chief.

faith who harass their neighbors. These harassed people call for aid and in answer to this call Alexander (the Lord in the Koran account) isolates the Gog and Magog by building a rampart of iron blocks and molten brass between the mountains, which the Gog and Magog can neither scale nor bore their way through. Cf. the Koran, sura xviii (lxix): 88-96, trans. J. M. Rodwell (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1929), pp. 188-189; Ibn Khordādhbeh, Kitab al-Masalik wa 'l-Mamalik, pp. 1 ff. (De Goeje, BGA, VI, 124 ff.); Wensinck, SI, IV, 1142; H. A. R. Gibb, Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa (London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1929), pp. 29, 370, n. 18. These elements seem to occur in the legends of the origin of the Turks, Kirghiz and Mongols. The Kirghiz originally lived beyond the Kōgmān Mountains, in a valley accessible only by a narrow defile. They emerged by this to destroy the Uigur Empire. The Mongols were enclosed in a valley but came out by melting the metal side of the mountain.

Descent from a wolf was believed by the Wu-sun, Shih-Chi, ch. 123, 9 b; and by the Mongols, Boodberg, HJAS, I (1936), 181, as well as by the Turks.

¹Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 2 b; Hsin T'ang Shu, ch. 215 shang, 5 b; cf. 卅九. The ancient reading of these characters (ca. 600 A.D.) was K 1129 t'uo' K 609 muen. According to the Ork. Ins. I E 1, II E 3, after the heavens and the earth had been created the sons of men were created; "over the sons of men my ancestors Buman Qaghan and Istāmi Qaghan were seated [as rulers]." Then follows an account of the conquests of these two qaghans. According to the Chinese accounts T'u-mên died shortly after he had gained independence for the Turks and was succeeded by his son, K'ê-lo, who also died before the year ended without any noteworthy achievements to his record. He was in turn succeeded by his brother Mu-han who was a contemporary of Istāmi, Mu-han in the east and Istāmi in the west. It was under Mu-han that the great expansion of the Turks took place. It is therefore apparent that some of the honors given Buman in the Ork. Ins. belong to T'u-mên, others to Mu-han. It has been suggested that the name Buman (Bumyn) is a combination of the two names T'u-men and Mu-han (Professor Sprengling's lectures). Mu-han 木汗 K 643, 296, muk-qân' is also written Mu-kan 木干 K 296 kân. In both cases the first syllable is "mu." We know that the Chinese sometimes used a syllable with an initial "m" to represent a Turkish "b"; cf. K 638, 342, mak (muo')-qâ' for "baga"--G. Schlegel, op. cit., p. 4. Thus "mu" for "bu" is possible. There is also a possibility, although very slight, of a scribal error in writing 卅 b for 卅 t. The presence of an "m" in the Turkish form of the name seems evidence enough that muen is meant and not kân or qân'. In either case the vowel to be supplied to 卅 should be "a" and not "y"; therefore, Buman and not Bumyn. Blochet, JRAS, 1916, 306-7, identifies the Dānu mentioned in Yasht, xiii, 38, with T'u-mên, as does Parker the Tumana of Abū'l-Ghāzī, KHR, XI (1896), 437. Blochet also considers T'u-mên to be a transcription of تمان tūmān, meaning "ten thousand." In this he is followed by Boodberg, HJAS, I (1936), 177, 23. However, it is generally held that "tūmān," "ten thousand," is not a Turkish word but a Persian loan-word, cf. Redhouse's Turkish Dictionary (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1880), p. 510; and consequently, too late to be equated with T'u-mên. Barthold, 12 Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Turken Mittelasiens, trans. Theodor Mensel (Berlin: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Islamkunde, 1935), p. 217, says it was borrowed by the Turks from the inhabitants of ancient Kashgar. It is perhaps significant

T'u-mên's quality of leadership was soon recognized as clan after clan moved in to pitch their tents under his golden wolf-head standard. His territory increased accordingly and soon began to encroach upon Chinese soil. When the two became contiguous T'u-mên sought to establish commerce with China in order to trade for silk and cotton cloths,¹ for despite the reputed savagery of these nomads they cherished fineries in textiles and food. Wên Ti, Emperor of Western Wei, saw in this an opportunity to gain an alliance with the Turks by which the power of the Juan-juan might be destroyed. Consequently, he sent an envoy to the Turks to frame a pact of friendship. If we are to believe the Chinese records, the Turkish people rose in joy upon this visitation, considering it a favorable omen, and said, "Today the ambassador of a great nation will arrive in our country; we are about to prosper."² To this T'u-mên responded in 545 by sending gifts to Wên Ti.³

Sometime thereafter a neighboring tribe of the Tölös invaded the Altai region with the intent to attach the Juan-juan but were intercepted and defeated by the Turks under T'u-mên.⁴ Thinking this achievement merited special recognition, T'u-mên requested a Juan-juan princess in marriage. Anakui, however, became enraged at his temerity and dispatched an envoy to rebuke T'u-

to the study of this name that the founders of three important Turkish dynasties bore names perhaps related to the same root. The founder of the Hsiung-nu Empire was T'ou-man, cf. H. Jacobson, "Rise of Turkish Power in Central Asia; History of the Eastern Turks (522-745)" (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Oriental Languages and Literatures, University of Chicago, 1938) p. 4, n. 1; and the founder of the Ottoman Empire was عثمان variously transliterated Ossman, Utman, etc., cf. F. Giese, Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken نوارىخ ال عثمان in Text und Übersetzung ("AKM," XVII [1925]), I, 12. Cf. also Parker, The China Review, XX (1892-93), 6, n. 91.

¹Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 2 b. ²Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b;

³Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 2 b; T'ung Chien Kang Mu, ch. 32, 14 a.

⁴Chou Shu, ch. 50, 2 b. Theophylactus Simocatta vii. 7. 8, says that the Turks fought the Abdel, whom Simocatta identifies with the Ephthalites which is quite impossible as Chavannes, Documents . . . , p. 221, has shown. The T'ieh-lô of the Chinese were identified with the Tölös by Hirth, Nachworte . . . , p. 37.

mên, saying, "You are our metal-forging slaves, how dare you make such a request?"¹ T'u-mên on the other hand, sensible to a double insult, killed the Juan-juan envoy and requested a princess from Wei. Wên Ti, happy of the breach, acquiesced.²

T'u-mên was unable to brook the shameful treatment administered by the Juan-juan, so early in 552 he assembled the Turks for an attack. The Juan-juan suffered a severe defeat; their chief, Anakui, committed suicide and his son took refuge in Ch'i which in 550 had succeeded Eastern Wei in the sovereignty of the northeastern provinces of China. The remainder of the Juan-juan proclaimed Têng-shu-tzŭ, uncle of Anakui, their chief.³

Following this victory T'u-mên styled himself "Il Qaghan" and called his queen "Qatun."⁴ He established court in the Ütükan Mountains, one of the ranges on the upper Orkhon.⁵ Having secured his position and that of the Turks, T'u-mên died (552). He was succeeded by his son K'ê-lo who again defeated the Juan-juan and sent a gift of 5000 horses to the Wai Emperor before he died in 553.⁶

¹Chou Shu, ch. 50, 3 a; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 2 b; Sui Shu, ch. 84, 1 b.

²Chou Shu, ch. 50, 3 a; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 3 a; T'ung Chien Kang Mu, ch. 33, 16 b, date 551.

³Chou Shu, ch. 50, 3 a; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 3 a; T'ung Chien Kang Mu, ch. 33, 17 b, spring, first month.

⁴Chou Shu, ch. 50, 3 a; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 3 a. Cf. Sui Shu, ch. 84, 1 b. 伊利可汗 K 272 𐰽𐰺 K 527 lji' K 414 'k'â K 296 𐰽𐰺 > -i-lji' 'k'â-yân'; there can hardly be any doubt that this stands for qaghan of the "il," in which "il," means "government" or "confederation," cf. Ork. Ins. I E 1, II E 3, et passim. 可賀敦 K 414, K 342 and K 1143, 'k'â-yâ'-tuan > qatun is also known in the inscriptions, Ork. Ins. I E 11, II E 10. On the history of these titles see Shiratori, "A Study of the Titles Qaghan and Katun," MTB, I (1926), 1-39.

⁵Hsin T'ang Shu, ch. 215 shang, 6 a; 都斤, Tu-chin Shan. These have been identified as the Ütükan by several, Hirth, Nachworte, p. 34, n.; Thomsen, MSF-Ou., V (1896), 152, n. 32; Schlegel, MSF-Ou., IX (1896), 21. Hirth and Thomsen identify the Ütükan with the Hangai range, to which Chavannes, Documents, p. 14, n. 1, does not object. Schlegel disagrees; he feels it must be identified with the Parkassutey Alin, between the Orkhon and the Tola. Cf. Pelliot, T'oung Pao, XXVI (1929), 212-19.

⁶Chou Shu, ch. 50, 3 a-b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 3 a; 科羅 K 417, 569, k'ua-lâ. Hirth, Nachworte, p. 6, has shown that a foreign "R" is often

On K'ê-lo's death the tribal chiefs set aside his very capable son, Shê-t'u,¹ in favor of the dead qaghan's younger brother who ascended as Mu-han Qaghan.² Mu-han was an extraordinary individual in character, ability and appearance. He had an unusually broad and ruddy face, glaring eyes and a fierce and unyielding nature. His one delight was to see the enemy cringe at his feet.

Mu-han inaugurated his reign by inflicting a final defeat upon the Juan-juan. Tên-shu-tzû, together with the other survivors of the conflict, fled to Western Wei³ while Mu-han's victorious armies overran the Khitans in the east and the T'u-yü-hun (565) in the Tsaidam.⁴ Having thus gained an empire and the respect of the Chinese court, Mu-han requested Chou, which in 557 had displaced the Western Wei Dynasty, to surrender the Juan-juan fugitives. The Chou Emperor consented and delivered several thousand Juan-juan to the Turks who brutally put them to death (565).⁵

Chou and Ch'i, the two states in north China, were at enmity. Chou enjoyed the friendship of the Turks established by T'u-mên with her predecessor Western Wei. Ch'i feared this alliance; consequently, envoys were sent to bribe Mu-han.⁶ Although Mu-han was attracted, envoys of Chou succeeded in diverting an alliance with Ch'i. As a result of this the Turks, allied with Chou,

represented in Chinese by an "L." Hence this name could represent something like "Koru," cf. Caferoglu, *Uygur Sözlüğü* (Istanbul: Burhaneddin Basimevi, 1937), p. 90, or Kul, Kulug, pp. 95-6. His title was 乙息記 K 176, 780, 332, 𐰽𐰺𐰍-𐰽𐰺𐰍-k'iet Qaghan. *Sui Shu*, ch. 84, 1 b, says he was the younger brother of T'u-mên.

¹Shê-t'u 𐰽𐰺𐰍 K 667, 719, 𐰽𐰺𐰍 (niep)-d'uo.

²*Chou Shu*, ch. 50, 5 a; *Pei Shih*, ch. 99, 3 a; *Sui Shu*, ch. 84, 1 b.

³*Chou Shu*, ch. 50, 3 b; *Pei Shih*, ch. 99, 3 b; Theophylactus Simocatta, vii. 7. 10.

⁴*Chou Shu*, ch. 50, 5 a; *Pei Shih*, ch. 99, 5 a.

⁵*Chou Shu*, ch. 50, 5 a; *Pei Shih*, ch. 99, 5 a; *T'ung Chien Kang Mu*, ch. 34, 2 b.

⁶*Chou Shu*, ch. 50, 5 b; *Pei Shih*, ch. 99, 5 b.

made frequent attacks upon Ch'i.¹

While Mu-han was occupied with wars in the east his uncle, Istāmi,² carried the conquest to the west. In all probability, Istāmi followed the traditional nomad route leading westward through Dzungaria. Enroute he encountered and defeated several tribes, ethnically allied to the Turks,³ who fled before him towards the Caspian and lower Volga. In the vicinity of the Caucasus were the Alans and other tribes who mistook the intruders for the dreaded Avars (Juan-juan). The invaders on the other hand cherished the benefits of the mistaken identity and with the prestige of the new name requested permission of Justinian to settle within his realm.⁴ Having been granted this permission (about 558),⁵ these pseudo-Avars proceeded not only to occupy their lawful territory but to terrorize and ravage all central Europe. Within four years they made themselves masters of this entire tract and in a series of

¹Chou Shu, ch. 50, 5 b; Pei Shih, ch. 99, 3 b. On these expeditions the Turks penetrated into the interior of present-day Shansi. Cf. Tung Chien Kang Mu, ch. 34, 16 a, 17 b.

²The form of the name is certified by the Ork. Ins., I E 1, II E 3. Of all the Turkish Qaghans Istāmi enjoyed the most universal renown. His name is found in only one of the dynastic histories, the Hsin T'ang Shu, ch. 215 shang, 5 b, where his name is given as Shih-tien-mi 室點密, K 1214, 1162, 617, śiēt-'tiem-miēt, and an alternate form 瑟帝米, K 717, 986, 615, set-tiei'-miei. He was the younger brother of T'u-mên and the second son of the Jabgu T'u-wu. In Arabic sources he is known as سنجار خاقان, Tabarī Annales, ed. M. J. de Geoeje (Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1879-81), I, 195, 196. There are several variations of his name in the Greek sources Σιλξίβουλος Menander Protector, Frag. 10 (FHG, IV, 205), Διξάβουλος, Menander Protector, Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 225), and Στεμβύς Χάγαν, Theophylactus Simocatta, vii. 7. 9. Marquart, "Historische Glossen zu den alttürkischen Inschriften," WZKM, XII (1898), 185; and Erānsahr, p. 216, has shown that Istāmi, Shih-tien-mi and Στεμβύς must be the same name. Parker, EHR, XI (1896), 439, recognized in the syllables -djibu (-djabu) -ziboul, and -zaboul, the Turkish title of rank "jabgu." Chavannes, Documents, p. 278, arrived at the same conclusion.

³Theophylactus Simocatta, vii. 7. 14, knows these as the Ούρα and the Χουννί; Menander Protector, Frag. 43 (FHG, IV, 246), does not distinguish two tribes but knows the invaders as Ούραρ Χωννίται. Cf. Chavannes, Documents, p. 231.

⁴Menander Protector, Frag. 9 (FHG, IV, 205). Cf. Gibbon, The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ed. J. B. Bury (London: Methuen Co., 1898), IV, 352.

⁵Chavannes, Documents, p. 231.

campaigns between 562 and 565 almost succeeded in annexing Gaul.¹ Their power continued to increase as the tales of their ferocity spread before them. In 626 they besieged Constantinople but were unsuccessful. For more than a century thereafter they continued to menace the Byzantine Empire before they faded from history.

When Istāmi learned that the pseudo-Avars had entered into negotiations with Justinian he hurriedly dispatched Turkish envoys to entreat the Roman Emperor not to espouse the cause of the fugitives since he intended to attack these himself after he had subjugated the Ephthalites.² But these envoys, who arrived in Constantinople in about 562, apparently reached their destination too late to hinder the pseudo-Avars.

Sometime between 562 and 568 the Turks conquered the Ephthalites,³ but the details of the conquest are somewhat obscured. It seems that when Istāmi arrived near the frontiers of the Ephthalite Empire, that is, perhaps in the vicinity of the Jaxartes River, Chosroes Anushirwan sought his friendship in order to avenge the death of Peroz, effected by the Ephthalites. Istāmi gave Chosroes a daughter in marriage whose son, Hormus,⁴ was to succeed Chosroes in 578. Shortly after this the Ephthalites were defeated, either by the Turks

¹Gregorius Turonensis, iv. 16 (23); iv. 22 (29); O. M. Dalton, The History of the Franks by Gregory of Tours (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1927), I, 186-7.

²Menander Protector, Frag. 10 (FHG, IV, 205); Theophanes Byzantius, Frag. 3 (FHG, IV, 270); Gibbon, op. cit., IV, 354.

³The limiting dates are certified by the reports of two embassies sent to Justinian by Istāmi. In the first, sent in 562, Istāmi informed Justinian that he was about to attack the Ephthalites, Menander Protector, Frag. 10 (FHG, IV, 206), and the second, sent in 568, reported that the Ephthalites had been defeated, ibid., Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 225); Theophylactus Simocatta, vii. 7. 8. Chavannes, Documents . . ., p. 226, taking into consideration time for travel gives the limiting dates as 563 and 567. Cf. also Drouin, Le Museon, XIV (1895), 81; H. F. Tozer, EHR, XI (1896), 444; V. A. Smith, The Early History of India, p. 374.

⁴Tabarī (Nöldeke, pp. 159, 167). The Persian version of Tabarī gives a detailed account of the negotiations for the Turkish princess and a similar account is to be found in the Shāhnāma, cf. Zotenberg, Tabarī, II, 161, 222, 246; Warner and Warner, The Shāhnāma . . ., VII, 329 ff.

alone or by a joint attack of Turks and Persians.¹

With the defeat of the Ephthalites the Turks inherited the rich territories of Khotan, Kashgar, Sogdiana and Bactria (Tokharistan). In strong contrast to other Turkish possessions these were inhabited by settled people, mostly of Iranian stock, and as in other settled areas the people engaged in agriculture, handicrafts of various kinds and in commerce. The sogdians of the Samarkand in particular had progressed in these matters. The rich soil along the Zarafshan was very productive, the climate temperate, hence the fields yielded abundant harvests and the region was famous for its fruits and flowers. The craftsmen are reputed to have excelled those of all neighboring countries in their skill and the merchants penetrated to distant regions.² The merchants of Sogdiana had for centuries sold silk to Persia. Most of the silk was imported from China but since the fifth century sericulture had become an important industry in Khotan and Samarkand.³ Silk was now exported from China by sea in large quantities and the Persian monarchs favored the sea trade. Consequently, Sogdian merchants who had become wealthy from the silk

¹Tabarī (Nöldeke, pp. 159, 167; Zotenberg, II, 162); Shāhnāma (Warner and Warner, VII, 329-332); Menander Protector, Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 225); Pei Shih, ch. 97, 25 a; ch. 99, 3 b; Sui Shu, ch. 84, 2 a; Mirkhond, tr. de Saey, pp. 364-5. The Persian Tabarī says that the Turks and Persians jointly attacked the Ephthalites while Chosroes killed the Ephthalite king. The Arabic version which is more authentic credits this to Istāmi. The Chinese texts record the conquest of the Ephthalites under the achievements of Mu-han Qaghan but this is perhaps intended to indicate that it was one of the events during his reign and not necessarily under his personal command. The Chinese texts make no mention of Persian aid in the conquest, nor is this intimated by Menander or Theophylactus Simocatta, vii. 7. 8. Although the Ephthalites are not mentioned in the Ork. Ins., the conquest is referred to, I E 2, II E 3, when mention is made of Buman's and Istāmi's empire extending to the Iron Gate. After this defeat some Ephthalites fled into the Badakhshan and Upper Jaxartes, others remained in Tokharistan, Drouin, Le Museon, XIV (1895), 287.

²For the account of Sogdiana see the mémoires of Hsuan Tsung--Seal, Si-yu-ki; Buddhist Records of the Western World, I, 32-3.

³Pardessus, "Mémoire sur le commerce de la soie chez les anciens antérieurement au VI^e siècle de l'ère chrétienne, époque où l'éducation des vers à soie a été introduits en Europe." Mémoires de l'Institut Royal de France. Academia des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, XIV (1842), 20; Reinaud, "Relations politiques et commerciales de l'empire Romain avec l'Asie orientale," Jou. As., 6 ser. I, 126, n. 1, and 435; Laufer, Sino-Iranica, p. 537; Beal, op. cit., II, 319.

trade were deprived of their profits. For this reason the merchants took advantage of the new political alignment, the relationship between Istāmi and Chosroes, and prevailed upon Istāmi to attempt to regain for them the Persian silk market. Istāmi was agreeable to this and selected Maniach, a Sogdian, to head the mission to negotiate with Chosroes. At the Persian court, however, the Sogdians found Chosroes attended by an Ephthalite minister, Catulphus, who, desiring to avenge the Ephthalite defeat, caused the mission to fail.¹

Having met with failure in Persia Maniach suggested that a land route to Constantinople be established since the ultimate market for silk, after all, was the Roman world. With this purpose in view Maniach arrived at the court of Justinian in 568.² On their arrival in Constantinople the Sogdians were disappointed to see looms and silkworms for they were unaware that the bombyx had recently been introduced and cultivated in Constantinople.³ However, since this industry was still in its infancy, and since Maniach and his colleagues impressed Justinian, the Byzantine Emperor accepted the proposal. To ratify the treaty, Justinian sent Zemarchus to Istāmi in 569.⁴

¹Menander Protector, Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 225 f.); Gibbon, op. cit., IV, 355; Chavannes, Documents . . . , P. 234.

²Menander Protector, Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 226).

³The silkworm is said to have been introduced into Constantinople by two monks about 550 A.D. The Byzantines had been dependent upon Persia for their supply of silk and with the hostility between the Sassanids and Romans it became difficult to maintain normal commerce; and besides, since Persia was the only source Persian merchants were able to dictate unreasonable prices for their goods. As a result of this Justinian sought to contract Hīmyarite and Ethiopian sailors to sail to India and purchase silk as it arrived from the east, Procopius, De Bello Pers., I, 20, 9. But when these arrived in India they found that it was impossible to break the Persian monopoly even here, ibid., I, 20, 12. At this time monks who had long lived in the east suggested to Justinian that it was possible to import the silkworm and start a domestic industry. Justinian then commissioned these monks to return east and bring back the worm which they did. Procopius, De Bello Goth., viii, 17, 1-8; Theophanes Byzantius, Frag. 3 (FHG, IV, 270-71); Gibbon, op. cit., IV, 355.

⁴Menander Protector, Frag. 18 (FHG, IV, 225-6), gives the date of Zemarchus' mission as the fourth year of Justinian, or 569; Joannis Epiphaniensis, Frag. (FHG, IV, 274), gives it as the seventh year, i.e., 572. Marquart, WZKM, XII (1896), 198, considers the former the more accurate.

